

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 11 | KEENAN G. WILKINS, |) | No. C 11-2704 LHK (PR) |
| 12 | Plaintiff, |) | |
| 13 | v. |) | ORDER GRANTING |
| 14 | COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al., |) | PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO |
| 15 | Defendants. |) | CHANGE TIME TO FILE |
| 16 | |) | SECOND AMENDED |
| | |) | COMPLAINT; DENYING |
| | |) | APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL |

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed an amended complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is Plaintiff's declaration in support of his request for a second extension of time in which to file his second amended complaint, request for appointment of counsel, request for a stay, and other alternative relief. Plaintiff's requests are based on his assertions that jail officials have not been giving him access to his legal documents.

Plaintiff's request for an extension of time in which to file his second amended complaint is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall file his second amended complaint within **thirty days** from filing date of this order.


Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED for want of exceptional circumstances. *See Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997); *see also Lassiter v. Dep't of Social Services*, 452 U.S. 18, 25 (1981) (there is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case). The issues in this case are not particularly complex, and Plaintiff has thus far been

1 able to adequately present his claims. This denial is without prejudice to the Court's sua sponte
2 appointment of counsel at a future date should the circumstances of this case warrant such
3 appointment.

4 In light of the extended deadline within which to file a second amended complaint,
5 Plaintiff's remaining requests are DENIED as unnecessary.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: 1/23/12


LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge